

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 17-22 are allowed. Claims 1-15 are rejected. Claim 16 is objected to. Claims 1-8 and 10-16 are amended herein for reasons of clarity and not for reasons of patentability as will be apparent.

In the Specification

The Examiner objects to several paragraphs in the specification as missing references to various reference designators in the figures. Applicants have amended specification paragraphs as recited above, to address the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner also requests correction of typographical errors and also recitation of application numbers previously left blank in the specification. Applicants have amended specification paragraphs as recited above, to address the Examiner's objections.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the objections to the specification should be removed.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Allweyer et al. in View of Pena-Mora et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Allweyer et al. "Model-Based Re-Engineering in the European Construction Industry" (1996), in View of Pena-Mora et al. "Dynamic Planning and Control Methodology for Design/Build Fast-Track Construction Projects" (Jan/Feb 2001)

Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention a change of inventorship filed June 23, 2006, which added Michael Li and others as inventors in this application. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the Pena-Mora article used by the Examiner in the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and bring to the Examiner's attention that the authors of the article, Pena-Mora and Li, are both inventors in the present application. Applicants submit that, since the article was published less than twelve months before the priority date (June 14, 2001) of the present application, the Pena-Mora article is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicants submit that the above rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is moot and should be removed.

Alweyer et al. in View of Mehta et al. and Pena-Mora et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Allweyer et al., in view of Mehta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,365) and Pena-Mora et al.

For the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13, and 14, Applicants submit that the above rejection of Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is moot and should be removed.

The Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to Claim 16 as lacking patentable weight. Claim 16 is amended herein for reasons of clarity and not for reasons of patentability as will be apparent. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objection to Claim 16 should be removed.

In view of the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-22 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

Reply to Office Action dated March 24, 2006

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845, including but not limited to, any charges for extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2006

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: 

Kermit Robinson

Reg. No. 48,734

Attorney for Applicant(s)

354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A

Canton, MA 02021-2714

Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 24

Fax: (781) 401-9966

*kr@dc-m.com*